

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL I

NEW YORK, JANUARY 11, 1908

NO 12

Elsewhere in this issue appears a summary of an article by Professor Sihler on American Classicism, which appeared in the *Evening Post* of Sept. 7, as the supplement to an article on a similar topic, published in the same journal a year before (Sept. 26, 1906). Professor Sihler had already discussed this subject in a series of articles published a few years ago in the *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*.

The articles do not furnish very pleasant reading for American students of the Classics. We cannot help feeling that in some way or other we have not lived up to our birthright, that, whether by our own supineness or by force of circumstances, we have let slip that which to our forefathers was a priceless possession, and as we remark the increasingly large number of American youth whose minds during the formative period have not been touched with the slightest breath of Greek culture, we cannot but feel that our educational system has not progressed.

In his brilliant essay, *Discipline vs. Dissipation*, Professor Shorey writes as follows (*School Review*, 1897):

The student who between the ages of twelve and twenty has thrilled at the eloquence of Cicero or Demosthenes, has threaded the mazes of the Platonic dialogue, has laughed with Aristophanes, has pored over the picturesque page of Livy, or apprehended the sagacious analysis of Thucydides, has learned to enjoy the curious felicity of Horace and the supreme elegance and tender melancholy of Virgil, has trembled before the clash of destiny and human will in the dramas of Aeschylus and Sophocles, has been cradled in the ocean of Homeric song, or attuned his ear to the stately harmonies of Pindar,—the student, I say, who has received this or a like discipline in the great languages and literatures of the world, has insensibly acquired the elementary materials, the essential methods, and the finer intuitive perceptions of the things of the spirit, on which all more systematic study of the mental and moral sciences must depend.

While this may sound to some like a rhapsody, I must fain believe that it is the sober truth, and so the perusal of Professor Sihler's article has led me to wonder whether our chief difficulty has not consisted in getting away from the authors themselves. Fifty years ago, we learn, on the thirtieth of December, 1847, was held the first meeting of the New York Greek Club, an association

whose members were drawn from many walks of life and from many varieties of culture. Their earliest meetings were devoted to the reading of papers prepared by members of the club, but they soon found that, instead of presenting their views about the Classics to their colleagues, it was more expedient to study the sources themselves of so much of the world's thinking. And so for years they read in succession the Greek authors, one member preparing, the rest following in the text. It is a unique story, that of mature men, busied with the cares of life, finding consolation and inspiration in the words of men whose names were great when the literature of the world was young, and I wonder whether we in our modern times are not persisting in the error which they were clever enough to see and reject. Almost every university has a classical club, almost every classical club has been troubled by the question of program, almost every classical club likewise has made the most important part of its existence the listening to papers prepared either by its members or by guests on topics connected with the Classics; almost every club has found it difficult to exist. Many have died, and the same experience is repeated when a new club is founded.

Now the classical authors themselves have stood the test of centuries of study by minds as great as themselves. They exist to-day with undiminished splendor and unweakened power because they are of the sort that perish not. They have presented their message for ages. It seems to be the irony of fate that to most of our classical students of the present day they do not present a message. Various courses are given in colleges and universities, many students read widely in Greek and Latin, but how few there are who mark, learn and inwardly digest only those who have occasion to examine know. Would it not be better to follow the example of the New York Greek Club, and let our students, young and old, read the great works of old in concert, with discussion? Would not the power of ancient literature make itself felt more where two or three are gathered together? It is possible—we know it so well—to read mechanically and not to know what we read. Is it not a pity that a work in Greek or Latin must always need

an interpreter? must every page of Greek require foot-notes and an appendix? must every page of Latin require an atlas and a classical dictionary? Can we not feel the master mind of Plato or Thucydides without a careful study of the Platonic canon or the temporal division of the Peloponnesian war? To my mind the Classics are dead only because we who teach them so regard them. If we were willing to act as priests of a living divinity we should find many to worship with us.

THE TRANSLATION OF LATIN

In some quarters there exists a feeling against the discussion of methods in the teaching of language. Each teacher, it is said, must build up his own method. This is true as to details, yet for all teachers dealing with minds of the same type the principles of teaching must be the same, though the details of application differ. It is with these principles, when applied to the translation of Latin into English, that this article deals, as they must be applied with regard to the immature minds of average secondary school pupils.

What is translation? Strange though it be, we probably could receive widely variant answers from teachers to this fundamental question. It is a complicated process, this art of translation. In its completed form it involves one of the most difficult literary exercises known to man. The total process may be resolved into several minor operations, only one of which has claim to be considered a real translation. Take, for example, this passage from the second book of the *De Bello Gallico* (2.10): *Hostes impeditos nostri in flumine adgressi magnum eorum numerum occiderunt; per eorum corpora reliquos audacissime transire conantes multitudine telorum repulerunt; primos, qui transierant, equitatu circumventos interfecerunt.*

In any attempt to translate this passage the first process is that of 'transverbalization':

'The impeded enemy, our men, in the river attacking, a great number of them, killed; over their bodies, the rest, most boldly trying to cross, by a multitude of missiles, they repelled; the foremost, who had (already) crossed, by the cavalry, having been surrounded, they killed'.

This gives an exact rendering of the Latin order of words and constructions; it gives us the Latin as it is, with a minimum of English coloring. To get the exact meaning of the passage such a preliminary survey is an absolute essential, unless we are so proficient that we do not need the medium of our own language to convey the meaning to us. But no one can pretend that the result is English.

A second process is a modification of this. It employs sufficient English idiom to make the sense perceptible, and alters the order for the sake of adhering to the Latin grammatical construction:

'Our men, attacking the enemy (when) impeded in the river, killed a great number of them, repelled with a multitude of missiles the rest, (who were) most boldly trying to cross over their bodies, (and) killed the foremost, who had (already) crossed, having surrounded (them) with cavalry'.

This sounds very familiar to the average teacher; it is the kind of translation called 'literal', sanctioned by the grammarian, required by the strict constructionist, and stamped with final approval by the classics of Bohn or Hinds and Noble. It has the virtue of being intelligible, but it is flat because it pays no attention to the emphasis, and it is couched in very weak English.

A third process—taboo in our schools—maintains the Latin order of emphasis, but disregards the grammatical construction:

'The enemy, when impeded, were attacked when in the river by our men, who killed a large number of them. Using these bodies as a bridge, the rest most boldly tried to cross, but were repelled by a multitude of missiles. The foremost, who had already crossed, were surrounded by our cavalry and killed'.

If translation be the transfer of exact meaning from the words of one language into those of another, this is a better translation than the preceding, for it gives the facts presented by the Latin in the order required, is livelier in tone, and is expressed in better English.

But as a matter of fact the last two examples present each one side of the problem. A perfect translation would employ idiomatic English without violating either Latin syntax or Latin emphasis. Since it is an impossibility to do this, the best translation can be only an approximation; yet in this uncertainty lies the charm and the value of the effort.

For illustration is presented an attempt to give a real translation of Vergil's famous lines (*Aen.* 6.851-853):

*Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
(hae tibi erunt artes) pacisque imponere morem,
parcere subiectis, et debellare superbos.*

There must be strict regard to the ideas conveyed by words and emphasis, and a suggestion of the stately rhythm:

'Your mission, O Roman, remember, fulfill it, rule you the nations;

These shall be your ideals, always to compel the observance of peace,

To spare the submissive and crush the proud'.¹

Which of these forms of translation shall we use in class, and by what road shall we teach our pupils to progress?

Notice that the second and the third processes are both contained implicitly in the first. The second retains the Latin syntactical construction, the third the march of ideas. The last of all differs from the first, or should differ from it, only in having regard to the finest English diction.

It would seem, then, that the first thing to be mastered is this word by word order, this transverbalization. The pupil should be kept at this until he has become fairly proficient; only then is he fitted to attempt a rendering in good English without injury to his Latin.

Here, no doubt, the objection will be urged that such a method encourages poor English. An obvious retort of the Latinist might be that even were this so he primarily is required to teach Latin, and in a reading method this is the only way to teach the Latin order of thought. Without an understanding of the Latin order of thought any subsequent instruction is built upon a foundation of sand. But let us waive this retort, and challenge proof for the objection. Does the method really inculcate poor English? Does it not rather inculcate a hodge-podge so different from English that no one is in the least endangered thereby? What pupil outside the class room will ever say, 'My mother to me said you to be sick', or any similar barbarism?

Yet poor English undeniably is heard in our classrooms, and sometimes taught there, too. But why? The reason does not lie in transverbalization per se, but in the continued use of the second process given above, into which the pupil's efforts at transverbalization very easily glide, in which he is encouraged by the teacher's anxiety—a thoroughly justifiable anxiety, too—for correct understanding of syntax, and in which he gladly practices himself as a substitute for the more arduous process of attempting a real translation. The danger comes from these attempts, so often heard, neither English nor Latin in idiom, although intended by the pupil as final renderings, and sometimes so accepted. Yet the only way finally to escape from such perversions—let us not deceive ourselves—in view of the limited knowledge of our pupils, is either to permit loose paraphrases, with sure disaster to Latin ahead, or else so to familiarize him with the Latin idiom by practice in transverbalization that later he can safely

and understandingly break away from it entirely when this is necessary for the sake of the English.

The teaching of transverbalization is slow, yet if pursued consistently not as slow as one would imagine. The grammatical drill should chiefly be based upon this process, where it belongs. During this period of instruction the teacher should not allow the pupil to get the idea that because his efforts are intelligible they therefore are real translations. When the question is asked, "Exactly what does the Latin mean?" then good English should be insisted upon. Let the English be English, and the Latin Latin; it is the confusion of the two that works mischief. This question, however, can not safely be asked of the pupil for some time. To insist upon a smooth English rendering without first making sure that the Latin is understood is bound to be disastrous. It is not very difficult for a bright boy to divine the general sense of a phrase, and to hit it off with a glib English expression. When he has once thus trained himself to depend upon superficial resemblances he can scarcely be brought to discard the habit, and must fly to a 'pony' for the more difficult constructions. But after the point is reached (as it will be in the average class in Caesar by the last third of the year) when the main grammatical principles are really grasped (with occasional lapses), and when the habit of taking a sentence word by word is accepted, then, with something of a wrench, the teacher must begin to insist upon as good English as the pupil is capable of forming. If this is poor, as it will usually be, let him pay attention to its improvement. The basis of this new process of translation must be three-fold; word meanings, which when unknown are easily secured from the vocabularies; syntax, to which attention always must be strongly directed; and word order, which now is almost entirely neglected. These considerations will often require a good deal of freedom in construing, but this is beneficial provided the Latin does not thereby suffer. By emphasizing these elements the pupil will come to appreciate the poverty of his own early renderings and the flabbiness of the 'pony' translations. The work will seem to him more vitally interesting and more practical, for he will gain some idea of the requirements of a really good translation, of the niceties of usage, the value of emphasis and the beauty of pure diction—and all without prejudice to his Latin. Of course his attempts will be crude, but even the crudest attempt undertaken in the spirit of trying to do justice to both languages is of higher educational benefit than either a glib paraphrase or a barbarized English rendering.

HEATHCOTE HALL, RYE, N. Y. E. CUTLER SHEDD

¹ Vergil urges his countrymen to rule in accordance with the responsibilities conferred by their position as governors of the world; the word *imperium* embodied a definite legal conception which "mission" in part suggests. The position of *regere* implies action, emphasis; this is supplied by adding "fulfill it". "Always" fills in shade of meaning in *morem*.

AMERICAN CLASSICISM

The Evening Post for Saturday, Sept. 7, last, contained an article by Professor Ernest G. Sihler, of New York University, on American Classicism. I quote in full the paragraphs relating to the New York Greek Club.

It was in this very town of New York that there was established a Greek Club, December 30, 1857, which club, if it had not lapsed and snuffed itself out ten years ago, would now be looking forward to its fiftieth anniversary and golden jubilee. As it turned out, the club lived and prospered mightily for forty years. Howard Crosby and Henry Drisler were the founders. On that distant December day these two professors, meeting in that humble abode of occasional or periodic contact, a barber-shop, determined to establish a Greek Club. The preparing of papers about the Classics soon gave way to that vastly better occupation, the reading of the Greek Classics, in rotation of assignment, when the average of ground traversed was about 12-13 pages of Teubner text. These indeed were *Noctes Atticae* more genuine than those of Aulus Gellius, gatherer of antiquarian and grammatical herbaria, botanist of the flowers of the classic Past. Most of those scholars into whose weekly meetings the present writer was invited twenty-eight years ago have passed to the Silent Land, but four stand out above the others.

Henry Drisler, Greek lexicographer, placid and imperturbable, successor and most eminent pupil of Charles Anthon, curiously non-perceptive of the aesthetical and historical side of classic letters, exponent of the second aorist.

Howard Crosby, charmer of souls, vivacious and earnest, free lance in all debates, versatile and incalculable in his sallies, quaint and obstinate defender of faulty and impossible readings.

Isaac Hall, Oriental and Greek scholar, endowed with the genuine scholar's swift and keen perception of the crucial point or of the sore spot in any critical controversy, pugnacious and defiant of mere authority.

Charlton T. Lewis, whose scholarly ideals and earlier training were gotten from Theodore Woolsey and James Hadley of Yale, of the much cited class of 1853. Lewis, I say, whose forms of domestic relaxation included Sanscrit and papers in the highest mathematics, Latin lexicographer, translator, essayist, organizer of reforms in public correction and reformatory institutions, in all of which activities he excelled without apparent effort. Lewis was the best reader in the club, advancing without a trace of hesitating or stumbling, ignoring no difficulty nor airily vaulting it, covering more ground than any reader in that company.

The club read and reread all the Greek Classics, all those called *classici* by Hadrian's Renaissance, Pindar no less than Xenophon; it was not desultory in choice and procedure, but generally pursued each author to the end. Of post-classic writers there were taken up Polybios, Josephus, Plutarch, Lucian, and a few others. It is a curious and significant fact, that one of the later members, an eminent authority and well-known to his generation as a publicist and economic writer, Mr. Horace White, has brought out an altogether admirable version of

Appian. The Greek Club then, and its life and work, were, and deserve to be recorded, in this year of a half-century's retrospect, as the finest vindication (right in this Trader's Babylon) of the nurturing strength and the mysterious charm of classic reading—a veritable graduate school antedating any one formally begun in America, and in its constituency and incentive—*sit venia verbo superbo*—perhaps superior to them all, for all were masters and still all were learners as masters ever are.

Looking back over the earlier history of American classicism the writer observes that at Yale in 1781 there was little Greek except the New Testament, and that even forty-five years later Kingsley was professor of Hebrew, Greek and Latin. In 1829-30 there were six "resident graduates". In October, 1830, however, there was held in New York a Literary Convention, the first general meeting of experts desiring to deal with the problems of higher education. Their avowed aim was to form a genuine university in America. Among those in attendance were George Bancroft, Theodore Dwight Woolsey, Robinson of Andover, Gallaudet of Hartford, Bates of Middlebury, Vt., Jared Sparks of Harvard, Stillman of Yale, and Francis Lieber of Boston and Berlin. The classical and the anti-classical spirit were represented by George Lieber and by Gallatin, then a man of sixty-five. The latter, eminent for his services as Jefferson's minister of finance, regarded the Classics as an "impediment arresting a more general diffusion of human knowledge". He advanced the specious thesis (repeated here in New York a few years ago by a distinguished university president): "*The Greeks knew no language but their own, therefore*", etc. He wisely did not go on to the Romans, nor to the Kelts, Goths or Longobards". Thirty-eight years later, in 1868, the American Philological Association was established.

Among the early teachers whose scholarly work still persists were Woolsey and James Hadley of Yale, Beck, Lane, Gildersleeve and Goodwin at Harvard. But despite their brilliant achievements the anti-classical spirit was steadily rising and "after the accession of C. W. Eliot, a chemist, in 1869, to the presidency of Harvard, the conviction that an unrestricted elective system for undergraduates might and should be dovetailed into the quadriennium of our preparatory schools was carried into execution, and then, if I mistake not, the knell of Greek had begun to be rung in America. Sophomores and research—nay, my masters, you cannot get cider from green apples no matter what the label on the cider press". In 1881 appeared the paper of Charles Francis Adams at Harvard, in which he termed Greek a fetich, and in 1882 he became one of the overseers. Dr. Lewis, returning

from his visits to Harvard, would say: "Greek is fast receding at Harvard", "Greek is fading away at Cambridge", "Greek is dying at Harvard".¹

Recent official records at Harvard show "some thirty classical students in a total of 378 graduate students. The work appears in three categories: (1) primarily for undergraduates, (2) for graduates and undergraduates, (3) primarily (therefore not exclusively) for graduates . . . (of the thirty graduate students) sixteen are put down simply for Classics, two for classical and Indic philology, one for classical archaeology, five for classical philology, one for English and Latin, one, just one, for Greek philosophy".

At Yale, of 353 graduate students twenty-eight are recorded for classical courses as follows: Greek, four; Latin, nine; Classics, eight; classical philosophy, one; Latin and Greek, five; history and Latin, one.

At Baltimore in Professor Gildersleeve's seminar there were recently recorded some thirteen men (some fifteen years ago on a visit I counted twenty-five), the same thirteen appear in the Latin seminar also: most of them seem to take linguistic science under Professor Bloomfield as well. Some of the Fellows thirty-one years ago . . . read thirteen hours a day. All intensive reading is extensive, I am sure, in widening enormously range and sympathy . . . when all is close and direct, and translating banished, then all further incentives seem vain and superfluous, it is then that the noble verse of Southey marks a great inward metamorphosis, and a perpetual vocation:

My days among the dead are passed,
Around me I behold,
Where'er these casual eyes are cast,
The mighty minds of old:
My never failing friends are they
With whom I converse day by day.

Mighty minds: at once we are led to discriminate between the cultural and the eruditional elements, between the original letters and the incrustation of many centuries. . . . There is a certain senility in some seminar youths, who can cite dittography and haplography, Arcadian and Cypriote dialects, talk of Phyles and Demes, of Ecclesia and Boule, and whose specialism reveals itself in ignorance of enormous masses of classical literature. Let not the academic young person be a pedant before his time, let him remember that he is still, at bottom, in the pre-critical period of life, where most apposite are the words of Macrobius' reminiscent mood: "Tum, cum admirabamur, nondum iudicabamus?" "*Woh Euch dass Ihr Enkel seid!*" but how can the doctorandus escape being smothered, during his triennium, by the strata of secondary and tertiary matter superimposed since Petrarch? T. E. W.

¹ In a Phi Beta Kappa address delivered at Columbia University a year or two, Mr. Adams, who had then just retired from Harvard Board of Overseers, gave evidence that he had gained a juster appreciation of its educational and cultured value of Greek.

REVIEWS

The Roman System of Provincial Administration to the Accession of Constantine the Great. By W. T. Arnold. New Edition, revised from the Author's Notes, by E. S. Shuckburgh. Oxford: Blackwell (1906). Pp. xviii + 288. \$2.00.

When Mr. Arnold's essay, which was originally written for the Arnold Prize in the University of Oxford, appeared nearly thirty years ago, it received a warm welcome as the only book in English which dealt with the administration of the Roman provinces. Its faults, however, were appreciated by the author, and it was his desire to revise and expand the work. From the realization of this hope he was prevented by his untimely death, and thus the task of revision has been undertaken by Dr. Shuckburgh. But the editor's alterations are few in number, and, with the exception of the welcome addition of an index, are confined to the bibliography and the notes, and the book remains what it was before—a good collection of facts, based almost entirely on Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, but inadequately treated and badly arranged. In an excessive fear of generalization, though admitting (p. 7) that "the administration was everywhere of much the same type", Mr. Arnold was too unwilling to draw conclusions, and too often presented merely facts instead of principles.

It was, however, in the arrangement of the book that the author was least successful. After dealing in two introductory chapters with the Limits of Period and Subject, and the Method of Acquisition and Organization of a Province, he divided the work into five parts—the Republic, the Early Empire, the Later Empire, Taxation, and Provincial Towns. The results of this arrangement are undue repetitions, unfortunate omissions, and the crowding of chapters with irrelevant material. Thus the *publicani* are discussed in the chapter on the Republic and again in that on Taxation, and both the legions and the census in the chapter on the Early Empire, while the provincial *auxilia* are omitted altogether. Again, the author inserted in the chapter on the Acquisition of a Province an excellent discussion of the Client-princes—a subject which deserves a chapter to itself, especially as the instances in which these kings were used to prepare their subjects for the rule of Rome (p. 16) are too few to make them important factors in the acquisition of provinces. Mr. Arnold's division, furthermore, rendered impossible any systematic treatment of provincial administration. By his chronological arrangement he was forced to deal with the position and powers of the governor in each of three chapters, thereby giving us three separate sections instead of one logically ordered ac-

count of the changes in the office between Sulla and Diocletian. The advantage of the topical method of presentation over the chronological is well illustrated by the chapters on Taxation and Provincial Towns, for these constitute by far the best part of the book, each giving, as it does, a lucid and systematic presentation of the subject. Thus much would have been gained in the way of clearness and completeness had the author adopted this plan from the beginning, and dealt in separate chapters with the governor, the minor officials, the army, the cults, the provincial *concilia*, the client-princes, etc. But even did Mr. Arnold deem it best to arrange the book according to chronological principles, he should have chosen striking changes in the government of the provinces to mark the limits of his periods. In the Early Empire the all-important moment is not Caesar's order for a land-survey of the Roman world, or his abolition of the tax-farming system in Asia, but the bestowal by the Senate of the proconsular imperium on Augustus, and the division of the provinces into imperial and senatorial, and the beginning of the third period should be determined not by Caracalla's edict of 212, but by the institution of Diocletian's system of prefectures, dioceses and provinces, and the separation between the civil and the military powers which this made necessary.

The original plan of the book Dr. Shuckburgh was unwilling to change. But he has gone too far in his conservatism, for he has merely recorded the titles of the books that have appeared in the field of Roman administration during the last thirty years, leaving their conclusions quite unnoticed. Much has been written on the tax-farming corporations, but the sections dealing with this important topic have remained unaltered, and although the work of Guiraud and Kornemann has increased our knowledge of the provincial *concilia* and their officials, and the day has long since passed when the order of the Augustales was supposed to have been imitated from the college of the Sodales Augustales, on these subjects too the editor has added nothing.

The book as it now stands is faulty and inadequate, and it can be of little use either to the beginner, because it is unsystematic and incomplete, or to the advanced scholar, because it lacks originality, and especially because it has failed to include the results of recent investigation. Accordingly it seems unfair to the author to republish in these latter days the essay of his youth, and we cannot but regret that Dr. Shuckburgh felt himself unable to rewrite and enlarge the book, and so make it in every way worthy of the two distinguished names which it bears on its title page.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

DAVID MAGIE, JR.

Boyhood and Youth in the Days of Aristophanes.

By Arthur Alexis Bryant. Printed from the Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, volume 18 (1907), pp. 73 ff.

The treatment of a rather familiar theme is justified by the genial and sympathetic picture presented of the Athenian boy. More than this, the author has made an independent examination of the sources in contemporary literature, and the completeness of the evidence brought forward is in itself a contribution. At the outset Mr. Bryant, from his own special collections, "nearly complete for the authors of the period" (450-375 B. C.), defines more closely the terms for the various stages of youth: *παῖς* ordinarily measures the period we call boyhood, up into the early 'teens' (this is apart, of course, from the generic use of the word as 'offspring' or its use as *servus*); *μειράκιον* includes the later 'teens' and early 'twenties', and so is nearly convertible with *νεανίσκος*; *νεανίας* is regularly used of a slightly older man, *παῖδιον* or *παιδάριον* of a very young child; in verse *παῖδιον* is frequent for *παῖς*, but there is no clear case of *παῖδιον* = *servus*. Yet a constant overlapping of terms is found; thus in Plato's *Lysis*, *Lysis* is variously called *νέος*, *παῖς*, *νεανίσκος*. The complete collection of examples is not printed, but enough is given to substantiate the usages.

The 'coming of age' Mr. Bryant, adopting the reckoning of Aristotle, sets at the beginning of the Attic official year that follows the eighteenth birthday. The right of the youth of this age to attend the ecclesia, to vote, and to take part in debate there is maintained. Aristotle's statement of the *ἀρετεια* of the *ἐφηβος* is denied for our earlier period, for the reason that even the orphans of citizens slain in battle were not thus exempted; and further, the amount of military service demanded did not justify it. Following Wilamowitz, Mr. Bryant makes an effective argument against the existence, in Aristophanes' time, of the ephebic college as Aristotle describes it. A veritable mass of incidents and passages is cited from contemporary literature, which, as concrete evidence, quite outweighs the more general considerations in favor of the institution, summarized by Girard in *Daremberg et Saglio*, 2, 2, pp. 622 ff. Just when the *ἐφηβεια* came into existence is the vexed question. The 'ephebic oath' with its ancient divinities and the support of one or two vase paintings is not evidence for the early presence of the formal ephebic organization; nor is the public arming of the ephebes—if this is really early. Mr. C. R. Morey (*American Journal of Archaeology*, second series, volume xi [1907]) interprets the painting on a black-figured Attic vase as "a representation of the public arm-

ing of the ephebes as it existed in the sixth century"; but it may equally well be the arming of the orphans. Even if Mr. Morey's interpretation be correct, the arming, like the oath, need be nothing more in the earlier periods than a ceremony connected with the conferring of citizenship. In truth, conclusive evidence is still lacking. If we prefer to regard the *ἐφηβεία* as a growth from older usages rather than as a late creation (Wilamowitz), we can still agree with Mr. Bryant that in Aristophanes' day the military service of the young citizen was not a serious hindrance to his ordinary occupations; it did not pre-empt two years of his life.

In the matter of education Mr. Bryant distinguishes carefully between theoretical ideals and actual conditions. The model youth of Plato and Aristophanes is admitted to be too highly colored for real life; he is rather "an index of the older Athenian ideal". The real essence of the New Education, in spite of Aristophanes' jeers, is seen to be a recognition of the inadequacy of the old methods to deal with a new order of things, a spirit of inquiry and of enthusiasm for knowledge. It is shown, too, that the literature presupposes more participation in the community life than has been commonly assumed, more contact with older men, in short more freedom, in a word, much the same freedom and the same restraints as the boy of good family feels to-day. In morals, Mr. Bryant believes that, despite the wild oats of the few, the normal young Athenian was sane and healthy minded. The sketch of the elementary curriculum is accompanied by the fullest references to the sources and here, as everywhere, the presentation of the evidence is noteworthy. In general, there is little advanced that is absolutely new; indeed the literature does not warrant new theories of a startling nature. Possibly more light may come from a careful examination of the monuments and the inscriptions. One regrets that this was not included in the scope of the article. A fuller discussion of the teachings and influence of the Sophists would also have been a grateful addition.

Princeton University.

EDMUND Y. ROBBINS

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

is published by The Classical Association of the Middle States and Maryland. It is issued weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College (120th Street, West of Amsterdam Avenue), New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY) are two dollars.

To persons outside the territory of the Association the subscription price to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year. Single copies are 10 cents each.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is conducted by the following board

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, New York

Associate Editors

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College

ERNST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

MITCHELL CARROLL, The George Washington University

Business Manager

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, New York

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising should be sent to the business manager.

ROEHR PUBLISHING CO., PRINTERS

35 MYRTLE AVE., BROOKLYN

Telephone, 2500 Prospect

..THE BROOKLYN VALET..

MAIN OFFICE

334 FLATBUSH AVENUE

CLEANS, PRESSES AND REPAIRS CLOTHES

442 Bedford Ave.

1239 Bedford Ave.

773 Flatbush Ave.

109 Montague Street.

TELEPHONE

3616 MADISON

**Rollins
TAILOR**

HOFFMAN HOUSE
BLOCK

1109 BROADWAY
NEW YORK

TEL. 3316 STUYVESANT

NEW YORK
PARIS
LEIPZIG

H. JAECKEL & SONS

Furriers and Importers



37 UNION SQUARE WEST

BET. 16TH AND 17TH ST.

COLD STORAGE PLANT

NEW YORK

Essential Latin Lessons, \$1.00

By A. W. Roberts of the Brookline Mass. High School and Prof. John D. Rolfe of the University of Penn.

The experience of a college professor and practical high school man unites in a successful endeavor to solve the many perplexing problems of first year Latin. Correlation of the study of English and Latin Grammar, the frequent review lessons, presentation of the verb by tense stems, the practical working vocabulary are distinctive features.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 153-157 Fifth Avenue, NEW YORK

The Gildersleeve-Lodge Latin Series

Among the notable books of this remarkable series are:

INTRODUCTORY LATIN. By F. P. Moulton, of the High School, Hartford, Conn.	\$1.00
BEGINNING LATIN. By J. E. Barss, Latin Master, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.	1.00
WRITING LATIN. By J. E. Barss. Book 1	.50
Book 2	.75
CAESAR'S GALLIC WAR. By H. F. Towle and Paul R. Jenks. Books I-IV	1.00
Complete Edition	1.25
EXERCISE BOOKS ON CAESAR'S GALLIC WAR. By A. I. Dotey. Books II, III and IV, 20c each. Book I	.25
CICERO'S SIX ORATIONS. By R. W. Tunstall, Classical Master, Tome Institute, Md.	1.00
JUVENAL. By H. L. Wilson, Johns Hopkins University	1.25
LIVY, BOOKS I, XXI and XXII. By E. B. Lease, College of the City of New York	1.25
SELECTIONS FROM THE ELEGIAC POETS. By J. B. Carter, Director American School of Classical Studies, Rome	1.25
GILDERSLEEVE'S LATIN GRAMMAR. By B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, and Gonzalez Lodge, Columbia University	1.20
A DAY IN ANCIENT ROME. By Edgar S. Shumway, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn.	.75

D. C. HEATH & COMPANY

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

A Vest-Pocket Memory-Test Latin Word-List

All the words used in Caesar and in Cicero's oratio is over 15 times (1288) grouped according to frequency of occurrence, together with all the words not previously included used over 5 times in Caesar (400), Sallust (90), Nepos (20), so arranged that the English meanings, which are on separate pages not visible at the same time, may be brought line for line into visible parallel columns by means of a simple folding device, (patented) by George H. Browne, A. M., The Browne and Nichols School, Cambridge, Mass.

Bound durably in full leather for the pocket. List price, 75 cents.

Boston New York GINN & COMPANY Chicago London

THE FIRST YEAR OF LATIN

By Walter B. Gunnison and Walter S. Harley

Prepares the pupil directly for the reading of Caesar

CAESAR'S GALLIC WAR

By Walter B. Gunnison and Walter S. Harley

Contains all the text, grammar and composition for second year work

For full information, address

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY

New York

Boston

Chicago

FIRST BOOK IN LATIN

By Alexander James Inglis, Instructor in Latin, Horace Mann High School, and Virgil Prettyman, Principal Horace Mann High School, Teachers College.

REVISED EDITION

12 mo. cloth, 301 pages, 90 cents net.

Provides for the first year student of Latin an adequate preparation for the reading of Caesar.

The Macmillan Company, 64-66 Fifth Ave., New York City

KNOX

WORLD RENOWNED HATS

452 FIFTH AVENUE, CORNER FORTIETH STREET
194 FIFTH AVENUE, FIFTH AVENUE HOTEL
ASTOR HOUSE, BROADWAY

HARKNESS'S NEW CICERO

Nine Orations,
\$1.25

Six Orations,
\$1.00

CONTAINS a scholarly and helpful introduction, and notes in keeping with modern methods of teaching.

Special attention is devoted to etymology and derivation. The illustrations are unusually choice.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

100 Washington Square

New York City

Siegel Cooper Co.

The Best Known and Most Popular
Retail Store in the United States

If you have any doubt of the accuracy of that claim it proves that you are not in the habit of coming here.

We urge you to make our acquaintance. When you do, you'll find out the reasons that have made this store FIRST in popularity and volume of business. They are reasons that affect you directly and economically, and you will be glad you came.

Siegel, Cooper & Co., Bankers, have a location in this store.

They offer conveniences for holders of small accounts not usually found in other banks.

On time deposits they pay four per cent. interest.

They pay two per cent. interest on accounts subject to check.

They are the largest distributors of "Home Safes" for the encouragement of economy in expenditure and the aggregation of small amounts.

Teachers' checks cashed. Accounts with teachers are solicited.

Hours 9 a.m. to 5.30 p.m.

Sixth Avenue, 18th to 19th Streets
NEW YORK CITY